

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Claims 4-7 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 8-10 are amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in original claim 4. New claims 12-21 are added. Support for new claim 12 can be found at p. 26, paragraph [0082] of Applicant's specification. Support for new claim 13 can be found in Figures 1 and 2 of Applicant's specification. Support for new claim 14 can be found in Figures 1 and 2, and at p. 17, paragraph [0051] of Applicant's specification. Support for new claim 15 can be found at p. 4, paragraph [0016] of Applicant's specification. Support for new claims 16 and 17 can be found in Figures 1 and 2 of Applicant's specification. Support for new claims 18-21 can be found at p. 23, paragraph [0072] of Applicant's specification. Claims 1-3 and 8-21 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to a solar cell module in which a plurality of solar cell elements are connected and disposed, and a photovoltaic device using the solar cell module. (Applicant's specification, at p. 1, paragraph [0001]).

OATH/DECLARATION:

The Office states,

"The specification to which the oath or declaration is directed has not been adequately identified. See MPEP § 602. Appropriate correction is required."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant's declaration identifies the corresponding PCT application. In addition, Applicant's declaration includes all the information that MPEP § 602 indicates is required for a declaration. Withdrawal of this objection is thus respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS:

The Office states,

“Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term convexconcave is not defined in the specification. For the purpose of this Office action, said claim has been treated as if convexconcave is convex and concave parts are provided in said rear surface member. Appropriate correction is required.”

This rejection is moot due to the cancellation of claim 7.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shihobi (JP 2002-168062). This rejection is moot with respect to claim 4 due to the cancellation of this claim. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as to amended claims 1-3. Claim 1, as amended, is as follows:

A solar cell module, comprising;

a front surface member having translucency,

a rear surface member,

an intermediate member between said front surface member
and said rear surface member,

a first solar cell element group in which a plurality of solar cell
elements are electrically connected, disposed between said front
surface member and said intermediate member, and

a second solar cell element group in which a plurality of solar
cell elements are electrically connected, disposed between said rear
surface member and said intermediate member,

wherein said intermediate member comprises a material that
reflects light.

Applicant respectfully submits that Shihobi cannot anticipate or render claim 1 obvious, because Shihobi fails to teach or suggest "said intermediate member comprises a material that reflects light."

In Shihobi, the intermediate member comprises air and is unable to reflect light.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Shihobi cannot anticipate or render claim 1 obvious, because Shihobi fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 5, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shihobi in view of Tetsuo et al. (JP 11-31834). This rejection is moot with respect to claim 5 due to the cancellation of this claim. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as to claims 8 and 9.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1, and are therefore, patentable over Shihobi for at least the same reasons discussed above. Tetsuo cannot remedy the defect of Shihobi and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office cites Tetsuo for teaching two or more photovoltaic cells in both sides of the middle sheet of glass and that the sheet of glass has translucency.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references cannot render claims 8 and 9 obvious, because the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shihobi in view of Masahi et al. (JP 2002-111035). This rejection is moot due to the cancellation of these claims.

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shihobi as applied to claims 1-9, in view of Kimura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,448,489). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1, and are therefore, patentable over Shihobi for at least the same reasons discussed above. Kimura cannot remedy the defect of Shihobi and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office cites Kimura for teaching a first solar cell string having connected said first solar cell element group and a second solar cell string having connected said second solar cell element group, a power conversion means for converting direct-current power to alternating-current power as well as controlling so that direct-current power is output at the maximum power point of these first and second solar cell string and a voltage adjustment means for adjusting direct-current voltage that is output from said second solar cell string and supplying the voltage between said first solar cell string and said voltage adjustment means wherein said voltage adjustment means adjusts the output voltage of said second solar cell string so that it coincides with the output voltage of said first solar cell string; and wherein said voltage adjustment means adjusts the direct-current voltage that is output from said second solar cell voltage which is to be the maximum electric power of said second solar cell string to coincide with the output voltage of said first solar cell string.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references cannot render claims 10 and 11 obvious, because the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/597,471
Amdt. Dated July 9, 2009
Reply to Office Action of May 12, 2009

Attorney Docket No. 81872.0121
Customer No.: 26021

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4600 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: July 9, 2009

By: 

Lawrence J. McClure
Registration No. 44,228
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: 310-785-4600
Fax: 310-785-4601